NTIA AUTHORIZATIONS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2181

RELATING TO THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MARCH 22, 1982

Serial No. 97-101

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
92-766 O WASHINGTON : 1982

5261-37

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon, *Chairman*

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona	HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
HARRISON H. SCHMITT, New Mexico	RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
JOHN C. DANFORTH, Missouri	ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas	DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota	WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky
SLADE GORTON, Washington	DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
TED STEVENS, Alaska	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
BOB KASTEN, Wisconsin	HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama

WILLIAM M. DIEFENDERFER, *Chief Counsel*
GERALD J. KOVACH, *General Counsel*
ANNE GAVAGHAN, *Staff Director*
RILEY TEMPLE, *Staff Counsel*
AUBREY L. SARVIS, *Minority Chief Counsel*
EDWIN K. HALL, *Minority General Counsel*
WIL K. RIS, *Minority Staff Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, *Chairman*

HARRISON H. SCHMITT, New Mexico	ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota	DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
TED STEVENS, Alaska	WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement by Senator Goldwater	1
Opening statement by Senator Pressler	2
Text of S. 2181	3

LIST OF WITNESSES

Wunder, Bernard J., Jr., Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce	3
Prepared statement	8

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1982

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in room 235, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Barry Goldwater (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Senator GOLDWATER. This morning the Subcommittee on Communications convenes hearings on S. 2181, a bill to authorize the National Telecommunications and Information Administration at $12.4 million. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of State to designate private individuals to speak on behalf of and for the United States at conferences involving international telecommunications matters. Senator Schmitt was instrumental in seeking the passage of this provision in prior Congresses. With the increased activity in international forums, it is important to insure private sector input.

As I indicated in my introductory statement on this bill, it represents a significant reduction of funding for NTIA from the preceding years. It trims NTIA back, however, from the state of uncontrolled growth it saw during the years of the Carter administration. Some of the activities NTIA undertook and for which there was grave need simply no longer exist. We can therefore reduce our support for some of these programs.

While I understand the need for cutbacks in some activities, I am somewhat troubled by the proposed total elimination of the public telecommunications facilities program. This activity has brought a public broadcasting service to States like Arizona, South Dakota, and New Mexico, where no service would exist without it. Recognizing a decreased need, this committee authorized the program at a decreasing rate beginning at $15 million for 1983. We did not recommend the phaseout until after 1984. Service to all areas is not yet complete. Thus, we have to maintain some minimum level of funding to accomplish this end—a small investment for the yield.

Finally, we want to insure that NTIA exerts significant influence in the coordinated development of U.S. policy in international telecommunications. I have spoken before on the deplorable inability of our Government to develop and implement a consistent and

workable policy in international communications. One example of this is the lack of coordinated policy related to the construction of the fiber optic cable for the northeast corridor. A recent letter from the State Department disclaimed having any national security concerns that would result from having any foreign carriers construct a vital link in our national communications system. I cannot believe that they do not even recognize the potential threat. Sometimes I think they want the Japanese to take over our markets. I know the Cabinet Council is looking at this coordination issue, and I expect results.

I welcome Mr. Bernard Wunder, whose outstanding leadership at NTIA we applaud. Mr. Wunder, I will ask Senator Pressler if he has any statement and then you may proceed as you care.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR PRESSLER

Senator PRESSLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a very brief statement. I shall place most of it in the record. I want to thank you for sponsoring S. 2181. NTIA has worked closely with other Federal agencies to develop and coordinate an effective Federal policy on international telecommunications issues, but I look forward to hearing more about these efforts this morning.

I am concerned to see that due to the reduced fiscal year 1983 budget request, the public telecommunications facilities program [PTFP] is scheduled to be phased out. There appear to be two arguments for the termination of this program.

First, there is the obvious need to cut unnecessary Federal spending in all programs and agencies. A second argument for the proposed termination is that these PTFP grants have largely served their purpose. Since the inception of the program in 1962, the number of public television stations in this country has more than doubled and public radio now reaches nearly 70 percent of all Americans. However, it is important to note that the remaining unserved percentages are primarily located in rural States, like my home State of South Dakota.

I understand the economic difficulties involved in providing Federal assistance for a public broadcasting service, which may not be cost effective. Some of the stations appear to require long-term assistance, even after initial funding. But I strongly believe that there is a larger principle involved. Rural America needs and deserves access to a variety of broadcasting alternatives. Frequently public broadcasting is the only such alternative for rural communities.

Last year I chaired hearings in this subcommittee on the subject of rural telecommunications. Many witnesses testified that rural States like South Dakota would benefit from such new and diverse technologies as direct broadcast satellites, low-power television, and cable service. Unfortunately, these promises are not necessarily going to materialize. DBS and low power are still being delayed by regulatory uncertainties. Cable television will never be economically viable for many farming and ranching communities.

As a result, public TV and radio offer the only alternative to network channels for hundreds of thousands of rural Americans. For instance, 60 percent of all South Dakotans are regular viewers of

the State's public television network, nearly 10 percent higher than the national average. This can be easily attributed to the lack of alternatives to network programs.

I know that the chairman shares my concern about the broadcasting alternatives in rural communities. I hope that this morning's hearing will discuss the proposed termination of PTFP grants in the context of rural America's broadcasting choices.

[The bill follows:]

[97th CONGRESS, 2d Session]

S. 2181

A BILL Relating to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is authorized to be appropriated for the administration of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration $12,417,000, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and other nondiscretionary costs, for fiscal year 1983.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to ensure the effective representation of United States policy, when selecting delegations to conferences involving international telecommunications matters, the Secretary of State shall, where appropriate, select—

(1) representatives of affected agencies of the Government of the United States upon recommendation by any such agency; and

(2) representatives from the private sector.

(b) The provisions of sections 202, 203, 205, 207, and 209 of title 18, United States Code, shall not apply to representatives from the private sector on a delegation of the United States to an international telecommunications conference or meeting who are specifically designated to represent the interests of the United States at such conference or meeting, with respect to a particular matter.

(c) All such representatives shall maintain on file with the Department of State any financial disclosure report which may be required for special Government employees.

(d) For the purpose of this section, international telecommunications conferences and meetings involving international telecommunications matters shall include conferences and meetings of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the International Consultative Committees for Radio and for Telegraph and Telephone (CCIR and CCITT), the Organization of European Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Economic and Social Council (UNESCO), the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (INTELSAT), and the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT).

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Wunder, you may proceed as you care.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD J. WUNDER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. WUNDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also have a prepared statement which I would ask be inserted in the record, and I have a very brief oral statement.

What we are asking for, Mr. Chairman, is $12.4 million, a reduction of $4 million from the fiscal year 1982 level. What we are doing is, as you indicated in your opening statement, Senator Goldwater, we are bringing this agency back to essentially where it was before this Carter administration and the significant growth that occurred during the Carter administration.

I do not see us involved in any less-important things than before. We are simply going to do it with less people. We will continue to do FCC filings on major issues, but we will not file on every issue,

irrespective of its importance or topic, and especially we are going to be active in those areas where we have technical expertise, for instance from our Institute for Telecommunications Sciences and from our spectrum management people. A recent example of that is our filing on two-degree spacing. We will continue to work with your committee and we will have the resources to do just that.

The overwhelming bulk of our reductions occur in our administrative and in our policy areas, with the biggest single reduction coming in the domestic common carrier area, which is the result of the settlement. The work that we have done already on comprehensive telecommunications legislation, I do not see that as being warranted to be funded at that high a level again.

I intend for the agency to be very active in the international area, especially in the conference work, which has always been a concern of this committee.

Second, I intend to be very active in the area of emergency communications that deal with national security and emergency preparedness issues.

We are not asking for a rescission in fiscal year 1982 for the facilities program, although we are asking for its termination in fiscal year 1983.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to respond to any questions that you or Senator Pressler might have.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you.

Do you have any questions?

Senator PRESSLER. Yes, I have four questions I will ask very briefly here.

There have been allegations that your proposed regulations on the implementation of the public telecommunications facilities program would not target the grant dollars to insure the presence of local public broadcasting service in rural areas. For example, I have heard that if a community receives a distant public broadcasting service via cable, this would be considered the delivery service under your priority 1. Is that true?

Mr. WUNDER. No, Senator Pressler. As a matter of fact, the way the regulations are targeted, it is to reach the rural and the unserved areas. If you look at the unserved areas of this country, as you indicated in your statement, they are areas like rural South Dakota, Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Montana.

So in terms of cable service, I think in the original iteration of the regulations, which has been subsequently changed, the interpretation that the allegation is based upon, they have been changed so that the receipt of a cable signal will only count if there is a 50-percent penetration level, not homes passed, but actually 50 percent receiving it.

And the purpose of that is simply on a priority basis. If you have an area in South Dakota that has no cable, as you indicated, and there is another area in Alabama that does have 50-percent cable penetration, I think the area in South Dakota should get it first. And that is the purpose of those regulations.

Senator PRESSLER. Good. I am glad to hear that. You know, I also understand that there have been allegations that under your priority 1 public telecommunications facilities program regulations, you would implement an absolute headcount policy; that is, the greater

number of people to be served, the greater the likelihood of funding.

How does this policy affect your determination that rural areas be served on a priority basis?

Mr. WUNDER. Well, what we try to do, if you look at the white areas—we call white areas, the unserved areas—what we are trying to do is get service to the greatest number of people possible. I think what you are going to see, Senator Pressler, as I have seen, is that where these priority 1 applications come from to begin with are rural and unserved areas.

So it is simply a mechanism to say if you have 125 grants to give, you want the greatest bang for the Federal buck, and you are not going to be getting any priority 1 applications from New York City because they are already served.

Senator PRESSLER. In your recent testimony before the House Telecommunications Subcommittee, you stated that there is a diversity of choice available to the American public in terms of broadcasting services. You mentioned low power, DBS, and cable. As you well know, cable may never be offered in many small towns, while DBS and widespread low-power services are still being debated by the FCC.

Are you aware of that? As a matter of fact, my home town of Humboldt, S. Dak., will probably never have cable. What are we going to watch?

Mr. WUNDER. I think, Senator Pressler, you make a very good point. I think that one of the things that we discussed at your hearings, and I testified at your hearings last year, is for areas like Humboldt, I really do think that we ought to work more aggressively in terms of letting telephone companies in areas like that supply cable service. I think that they may be the only ones there with the presence and with the capability to do that.

However, DBS is coming along and it will serve rural areas. But as you indicate, that will be a while.

I think in terms of our facilities program, which you also mentioned in your statement, it has really come down to a question of priorities in spending. There is a necessity to cut the federal budget. And in terms of this program, although there are still some unserved areas, they are not significant in terms of television, percentagewise, and in terms of radio we are reaching the point where we can reach just about every place that we can reach because after you get above a certain point you run out of spectrum space. There is not enough available spectrum space. So that is why we are talking about the elimination of that program.

Senator PRESSLER. My final question involves the C span, the broadcasting of the House of Representatives. I understand that across the country the broadcast of the House of Representatives is being dropped by a lot of cable stations and replaced with 24-hour sports and other things that are more popular. There has been an article written about this and I am just getting a copy of it.

But when the cable bill was up for consideration a year or two ago, we were going to have all this public service and so forth, and now we see it is quietly being dropped. Don't get me wrong. But I would not have found out about this except I was on C span the other night for a call-in question session and they were telling me

about all the local cable stations that were dropping it and replacing it with something that is more profitable.

Now you cannot blame them, I suppose, but on the other hand, this whole business of public service becomes more important. Are you aware of that?

Mr. WUNDER. I was on the same show and got the same questions earlier. I think the principal problem, at least for a lot of the cable systems that I am aware of, is that we have a lot of convergence. We have a lot of 12-channel systems with not a lot of channel capacity, plus the emergence of a lot of new programing services. And it seems, just as you suggest, the trend is going that way. You are going to pay programing. You are going to E span and other more potentially lucrative offerings.

I think that what seems to me should happen is that with respect to those 12-channel systems, most of them I would suspect are coming up for refranchising because they are old systems and the franchises are usually 15 years. And it seems to me that that is the place that that issue can be dealt with because C span and the House of Representatives proceedings are something that are in the public interest and I think that that mechanism, refranchising, for most of those systems, can be utilized to get that type of programing back on.

And I think secondly, I know that when I was on the show, all the people who were calling in, Brian Lamb was telling them to call their station, to call the cable people and tell them you want to see this. I feel sure they do not have very good ratings data. I was looking at some ratings data for the sports network, and C span must have a really small audience if it is lower than E span's.

Senator PRESSLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to be a cosponsor of this bill and I thank you for sponsoring it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Wunder, some have argued that a $12.4 million authorization figure represents bare bones for the agency. I see it as bringing on a restoration of NTIA's original role. However, where do you see NTIA going in the next, say, 5 years? What do you see as options for the role of the NTIA in the executive branch?

Mr. WUNDER. Senator Goldwater, in the next 5 years I see this. I see the work of the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences, which does the research work in Boulder, Colo. for a lot of Government agencies, for the Defense Department and FAA and others, as continuing. It is a very significant support role. They do a lot of work in radio propagation. I see the spectrum management portion where NTIA manages the Federal Government's portion of the spectrum as being essentially the same.

I see a new emphasis being placed on international work, especially the conference work, and especially some of the international policy work.

S

Most of the domestic issues, it seems to me, unlike say 10 years ago, are, as a result of either legislation or as a result of FCC action, the things that were started are coming to fruition, and I see a much greater emphasis on the international side than on the domestic side.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you.

I understand that the President's Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade is examining the roles of the State Department, NTIA and others in developing consistent U.S. policy in international telecommunications. What is NTIA's role in these discussions, and what do you expect the result to be?

Finally, when can we expect to hear something?

Mr. WUNDER. We have been looking at that very actively for about 30 days now, Senator Goldwater, and it is recognition of the problems that have been cited by you, by Senator Schmitt and by Senator Packwood and people on the House side, that a reexamination need to occur with respect to how policy is made and how policy is coordinated in the executive branch.

I would suspect, in terms of a timing on the resolution of it, that it should be fairly quickly. One of the reasons for the Cabinet councils is that they are a body that you can get quick decisions from. In terms of our role, we in the State Department have been very active in this. So we are playing a fairly significant role in this. In fact, it was at our urging that the subject was brought up.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you.

NTIA had a major role in several areas of international communications, such as the transporter data flow, privacy, and international information policy. Will NTIA continue to be involved in these areas?

Mr. WUNDER. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, those are some of the areas that I think need to have more attention paid to them. Those are the types of issues I was referring to in response to your question about the 5-year future.

Senator GOLDWATER. What role, if any, do you have in attending and having a voice in the international frequency conferences?

Mr. WUNDER. We at this time mostly are the technical support for those conferences, and essentially the policymaking body is the State Department. We have the engineers and we have the spectrum specialists and they play a significant technical role.

Senator GOLDWATER. Did you attend the last one?

Mr. WUNDER. Did I attend the last conference?

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. WUNDER. No, not in Rio, no, sir. I plan to attend the next one in Nairobi.

Senator GOLDWATER. I have always felt, for many, many years, that the United States is very weak in those conferences. We do not come out with the type of spectrum that we should have, and we see more and more of the spectrum going to the developing Third World, So I hope you will plan to attend the next one. I would like to attend it myself and I probably will.

Mr. WUNDER. I quite agree with you, Senator Goldwater, and with, it seems to me, the lessening need in terms of my own time on the domestic issues, because last year your legislation was going forward, and in terms of my time, I intend to spend a lot more of my time on the international side than on the domestic side.

Senator GOLDWATER. Keep it up.

Mr. Wunder, the level of $12.4 million assumes no funding for the public telecommunications facilities program. If the program were continued, say at $15 million, would $12.4 million be sufficient to administer the program?

Mr. WUNDER. We would probably have to get some additional money. I think there is $250,000 in the budget to close out the program. If it were continued at the existing level, it would probably take around $800,000. So there would probably be about a $550,000 shortfall.

Senator GOLDWATER. That figure you just used is one we have tossed around, too.

The request for international functions is being drastically reduced from fiscal year 1982, $1.9 million, to $827,000. What international programs are being reduced or eliminated, and why?

Mr. WUNDER. The only thing that is being reduced is the facilities activity, and the purpose of that reduction is most of that work has been substantially done. Second, we had being funded in 1982 some fairly significant and costly studies that I wanted done because they are the underpinnings of what has to go forward. As I indicated earlier, we are going to do the same amount. We are just going to do it with less people.

Senator GOLDWATER. I want to thank you on behalf of the committee for coming, and I think I am safe in telling you that it is the opinion of the entire committee that you are doing a very, very fine job. Just keep it up.

Mr. WUNDER. Thank you, Senator Goldwater.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF BERNARD J. WUNDER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

I appreciate this opportunity to urge the extension of the authorization for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). We recommend that the Subcommittee act favorably on legislation authorizing NTIA at the $12,417,000 appropriations level that is included in the President's budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1983. The Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) would not be included within this amount. NTIA is currently responsible for administering this matching grant program, but it has a separate authorization. The Administration has also recommended that this grant program be terminated at the end of fiscal 1982.

NTIA, by way of background, is one of the smaller operating agencies within the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is the successor agency to the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, which was established by President Nixon in 1970, and merged with the Commerce Department's Office of Telecommunications in 1978 by President Carter. NTIA is not really a new agency. OTP, for example, was the successor to variously named White House agencies dating back to the Office of the President's Telecommunications Adviser, established by President Truman. The Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) was created by then-Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover in 1922 to manage the Federal Government's own use of the radio frequency spectrum. The IRAC advised OTP, as it now advises NTIA, in discharging this important statutory responsibility (47 U.S.C. Sec. 305 (1976)).

Under the 1978 legislation and accompanying Executive Order formally establishing it, NTIA has basically two roles. First, it discharges the President's statutory responsibilities to manage Federal radio spectrum usage, through delegations from the Secretary of Commerce. Second, NTIA serves as the chief Executive branch policy formulator and adviser on telecommunications policy issues.

In fiscal year 1982, NTIA was authorized appropriations of $16,483,000. Prior to fiscal 1982, NTIA had an indeterminate or permanent authorization. This was changed, however, to a determinate, one-year authorization by provisions of the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (P.L. 97-35, section 1255), a change that we urged and supported.[1]

[1] See Statement of Acting Assistant Secretary Dale N. Hatfield on H.R. 3240 and H.R. 1891 before the House Telecommunications Subcommittee, April 30, 1981.

In fiscal 1983, NTIA's budget request calls for an appropriation of about $12.4 million. This represents a necessary decrease of about $4 million from 1982 levels, for salaries and expenses.

Decreases are proposed in our domestic and international policy development activities. In regard to broadcasting, cable television, and similar services, for example, we do not believe that our participation in FCC proceedings and rulemakings will have to be as extensive as in the past. This is because in large part the FCC has already acted affirmatively on most of our major policy recommendations. In the common carrier area, the recent proposed settlement of the Justice Department's *AT&T* antitrust case has also resolved many of the structural problems that previously were the focus of both regulatory and Congressional proceedings.

NTIA was a principal player in the FCC's Second Computer Inquiry, Direct Broadcast Satellite, and Low Power Television rulemakings, for example, in 1979 through 1981. The fundamental policies have already been established in these important areas, however, and there is thus no real need for us to participate heavily in the actual policy implementation process. I expect that while the FCC seeks to implement its decisions in these areas, moreover, it is unlikely to commence any major new policy changes. We intend to participate in any substantial proceedings that arise, and to monitor industry and regulatory developments closely. While we thus will be commenting on any important national policy questions, should they arise, the level and intensity of our involvement will be significantly lower, which is reflected in our fiscal 1983 budget proposals.

Our efforts in the telecommunications applications, information technology, and related policy areas in fiscal 1983 can also and, indeed, should be reduced. We are proposing to terminate our public service satellite program, for instance. This program was designed to assist in aggregating public service use of communications satellites, and it has been successful in showing how this can be done both technically and economically. The program was never intended to be a long-term, operational grant program, however, but rather more of a limited experimental effort. In fiscal 1982, we submitted a reprogramming request concerning this program. We have now supported public service satellite efforts for two years. We believe that it is appropriate for us to discontinue our support and thus to allow these efforts to go forward on their own.

Similarly, we are proposing reductions in our privacy protection and information policy development activities. NTIA, for example, previously was involved heavily in urging new, additional Federal privacy protection legislation. Some of that proposed legislation, however, has been enacted. In 1980, for instance, Congress passed the Privacy Protection Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 2000a (Supp. 1981)) and resolved important newsroom search issues that had arisen following the Supreme Court's 1978 *Stanford Daily* decision.[2]

Legislation along the lines of the insurance records privacy bill NTIA previously urged Congress to pass also has now been enacted by ten States. Two major States—California and Illinois—passed this "Insurance Information and Privacy Protection Model Act" very recently. In addition, we have been very successful in obtaining support from the private sector for the OECD Privacy Protection Guidelines. At last count, we had strong letters of endosement from 152 U.S. corporations and from most of the relevant industry associations. In light of this affirmative and commendable private sector action, as well as the steps taken by the States, there is no longer any compelling public policy need for a major NTIA program in the privacy protection area.

Decreases are being recommended in some of our radio spectrum management related activities. We are proposing, for example, to terminate our past role as coordinator of Federal research concerning the biomedical and related effects of nonionizing radiation. This role, I believe, is important, but it may be more appropriately undertaken by an agency with direct responsibilities in the health, environmental protection, or other safety-related fields, not by the Department of Commerce, whose basic mission is to foster business, trade, and increased industrial production.

In supporting passage of a determinate authorization bill last year, we stated that such new legislation was appropriate and desirable for two reasons. First, many of NTIA's functions interrelate with those of the FCC. And, second, the telecommunications and related industries are among our most rapidly changing.

The decreases in authorized appropriations called for in NTIA's budget recommendations for fiscal 1983, reflect these two facts. First, many of the major domestic communications policy debates that were previously the focus of substantial NTIA efforts have now been basically resolved. At issue before the FCC now is not formu-

---

[2] *Zurcher* v. *Stanford Daily*, 436 U.S. 547 (1978).

lating new policies but rather the implementation of policy decisions that have already been made. We intend closely to monitor the FCC's implementation actions and to participate if and when key issues and questions arise. Fewer resources will be required adequately to discharge this role, however. At the same time, moreover, we do not foresee the FCC taking any major new initiatives in fiscal 1983 that will require our extensive participation. The FCC, rather, is likely to concentrate—and appropriately so—on working out the details of the many policy decisions that are currently on the regulatory "agenda."

Second, we are proposing reductions in other NTIA program areas, such as our privacy program, for example. This is in recognition of the fact that in many of these relevant areas, substantial progress toward achieving the basic program goals has been accomplished. It is thus appropriate that reductions in our budget be made in recognition of the fact that changed circumstances have obviated the need for major NTIA involvement.

In fiscal 1983, we intend fully and responsibly to meet all of NTIA's statutory responsibilities. I believe that we can do so effectively and efficiently within the spending levels required for 1983.

In conclusion, we recommend that the Subcommittee act favorably on legislation that would extend the authorization of appropriations for NTIA for one year at an amount not to exceed $12,417,000 million. NTIA stands ready, of course, to provide you with the further information and assistance in this conjunction that you may require.

Appendix to Fiscal 1983 Authorization Statement—NTIA Appropriation History: 1980–83

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINSTRATION; APPROPRIATION HISTORY 1980–82

[Dollars in thousands]

	1980		1981		1982 Currently available [1]		1983 Budget request	
	Perm. pos.	Amount	Perm. pos.	amount	Perm. pos.	Amount	perm. pos.	Amount
Activity/subactivity:								
1. Policies for the development of telecommunications industries:								
(a) Broadcasting, cable and special services	10	$941	10	$956	7	$738	6	$591
(b) Domestic common carrier	18	1,136	16	1,185	12	1,464	7	423
(c) International telecommunications policy	9	761	8	787	13	1,718	11	827
Subtotal	37	2,838	34	2,928	32	3,920	24	1,841
2. Efficient use of telecommunciations and information systems:								
(a) Telecommunications applications	35	3,757	25	3,635	17	1,823	12	970
(b) Information technology and policy	32	3,814	30	2,354	22	2,428	17	1,153
Subtotal	67	7,571	55	5,989	39	4,251	29	2,123
3. Management of telecommunications resources:								
(a) Spectrum policy	14	890	14	915	13	1,054	12	800
(b) Spectrum management and planning	124	4,942	131	5,897	123	6,183	123	6,789
(c) Technology for efficient use of spectrum	8	502	7	523	8	559	8	614
Subtotal	146	6,334	152	7,335	144	7,796	143	8,203

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINSTRATION; APPROPRIATION HISTORY 1980–82—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

	1980		1981		1982 Currently available [1]		1983 Budget request	
	Perm. pos.	Amount	Perm. pos.	amount	Perm. pos.	Amount	perm. pos.	Amount
4. Public telecommunications facilities:								
(a) Public telecommunications facilities administration, subtotal	19	901	19	985	4	516	.....	250
Total S. & E	269	17,644	260	17,237	219	16,483	196	12,417
Public T. & C. facilities, plan. & const	.....	23,705	.....	19,705	.....	18,000	.....	.....
Total, NTIA	269	41,349	260	36,942	219	34,483	196	12,417

[1] Reflects proposed reprogramming of $1,262,000 from T/C applications and $250,000 from broadcasting into international T/C policy ($881,000), common carrier ($231,000) and $400,000 to fund October 1981 pay raise cost.

Senator GOLDWATER. The committee will stand adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 9:25 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○